

REMARKS

The applicant thanks the examiner for the telephone interview dated February 20, 2008, in which claim 53 and the Futagawa reference were discussed.

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

1. Claims 53-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Futagawa (US 10642951)

Regarding to claim 53:

Futagawa discloses an apparatus comprising:

droplet ejection devices (FIG. 1a) each comprising an element (FIG. 1a, elements 5-6) to change a volume of a fluid chamber (FIG. 1a, element 2) of one of the droplet ejection devices, the element having an electrical capacitance (FIG. 1b); and control circuitry to effect uniform droplet velocities (Abstract) from the droplet ejection devices by providing respective charge voltages or charge currents to the volume changing elements (FIGS. 2a-b, 8d, 9d).

As discussed during the telephone interview, the examiner meant to refer to Futagawa as patent 5,631,675.

The applicant notes that Futagawa does not describe and would not have made obvious control circuitry to effect uniform velocities of droplets ejected “from at least two different ones of the droplet ejection devices” by providing respective charge voltages or charge currents to the volume changing elements to individually control a charge on each volume changing element, as recited in amended claim 53.

In one example, Futagawa discloses adjusting the wave height of the driving voltage V_s in accordance with the temperature in the environment to compensate for viscosity characteristics of the ink (col. 15, lines 5-11). In another example, Futagawa discloses controlling the frequency of a clock signal in accordance with the temperature in the environment to compensate for viscosity characteristics of the ink (col. 15, lines 32-38). However, Futagawa does not disclose or suggest effecting uniform velocities of droplets ejected from at least two different ones of the droplet ejection devices, as recited in claim 53.

Moreover, Futagawa does not describe and would not have made obvious effecting uniform velocities of droplets by providing respective charge voltages or charge currents to the volume changing elements to “individually control a charge on each volume changing element,” as recited in amended claim 53. Futagawa discloses a driving voltage generator 10a that includes a variable constant voltage source 40 for outputting a voltage V_k that is dependent on the temperature of the environment (col. 8, lines 26-31). However, Futagawa does not disclose or suggest providing respective charge voltages or charge currents to the volume changing elements to individually control a charge on each volume changing element, as recited in amended claim 53.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as those applied to the claims on which they depend.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply \$1,050 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Fontaine et al.
Serial No. : 10/642,951
Filed : August 18, 2003
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 09991-042001

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2008 _____

/Rex I. Huang/ _____
Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906